

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

OLLIE GREENE, et al,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION,
et al.**

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CAUSE NUMBER: 3:11-cv-0207-N

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO TOYOTA DEFENDANTS'
AMENDED DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS AND PLAINTIFFS'
REBUTTAL AND CROSS DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS**

Plaintiffs Ollie Greene, Individually and as the surviving parent of Wyndell Greene, Sr., William Greene, as the Administrator of the Estate of Wyndell Greene, Sr. and Marilyn Burdette Hardeman, Individually and as the surviving parent of LaKeysha Greene (collectively hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs"), files their Objections to Toyota Defendants' First Amended (Corrected) Deposition Designations and as that the Court not permit any defendant to use the testimony to which objections are made. In addition, Plaintiffs designate their Rebuttal and Cross designations as follows:

Deposition of Andrew Adams

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to any use of this deposition on the grounds that the testimony is not relevant to any issue to be decided. However, even if the testimony were relevant it should be excluded under FRE 403 on the grounds that the probative value of the testimony, if any, is substantially outweighed by the danger of jury confusion and unfair prejudice	

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 7, Line 13 - Page 8, Line 9		
Page 17, Line 13 - Page 17, Line 15	Optional Completeness	17:16-18
Page 18, Line 8 - Page 18, Line 12		
Page 18, Line 15 Page 19, Line 7		
Page 19, Line 10 - Page 20, Line 16	Object to 20:12-16 on the grounds that testimony is irrelevant and calls for speculation; it is also confusing and misleading as to this witnesses personal knowledge as opposed to FRCP 30(b)(6) testimony that he did not investigate prior to his deposition	22:3 – 24:1
Page 20, Line 19 - Page 20, Line 24	Object to 20:19-20 on the grounds that testimony is irrelevant and calls for speculation; it is also confusing and misleading as to this witnesses personal knowledge as opposed to FRCP 30(b)(6) testimony that he did not investigate prior to his deposition	22:3 – 24:1
Page 21, Line 2 - Page 21, Line 7	Object on the grounds that this testimony is irrelevant and calls for speculation; it is also confusing and misleading as to this witnesses personal knowledge as opposed to FRCP 30(b)(6) testimony that he did not investigate prior to his deposition	22:3 – 24:1
Page 21, Line 10 - Page 21, Line 10	<i>Id.</i>	<i>Id.</i>
Page 22, Line 3 Page 22, Line 6		
Page 22, Line 8 Page 22, Line 9		
Page 22, Line 12 Page 22, Line 13		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 23, Line 20 Page 24, Line 3	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is an attempt to offer unqualified, untested and untimely expert testimony and to allow this witness to give a self-interested legal opinion regarding the EU regulations. Additionally, it is also speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	24:15 – 25:21
Page 24, Line 6 Page 24, Line 7	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is an attempt to offer unqualified, untested and untimely expert testimony and to allow this witness to give a self-interested legal opinion regarding the EU regulations. Additionally, it is also speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	24:15 – 25:21
Page 25, Line 22 Page 25, Line 25		
Page 26, Line 9 Page 26, Line 10		
Page 26, Line 17 Page 27, Line 1	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is an attempt to offer unqualified, untested and untimely expert testimony and to allow this witness to give a self-interested legal opinion regarding the EU regulations. Additionally, it is also speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 27, Line 5 Page 27, Line 15		
Page 31, Line 8 Page 31, Line 17		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 31, Line 20 Page 31, Line 21	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is an attempt to offer unqualified, untested and untimely expert testimony and to allow this witness to give a self-interested speculative opinion regarding his employer's foreign affiliate. Additionally, it is also hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 31, Line 24 Page 32, Line 7		
Page 38, Line 9 Page 38, Line 11		
Page 39, Line 19 Page 39, Line 21	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is an attempt to offer unqualified, untested and untimely expert testimony and to allow this witness to give a self-interested legal opinion regarding the EU regulations. Additionally, it is also speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	38:19 – 39:18
Page 39, Line 24 Page 40, Line 1	<i>Id.</i>	
Page 40, Line 15 Page 40, Line 22		40:25
Page 41, Line 15 Page 41, Line 15		
Page 47, Line 12 Page 47, Line 21		
Page 47, Line 12 Page 47, Line 21		
Page 47, Line 24 Page 48, Line 1		
Page 48, Line 5 Page 49, Line 7		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 49, Line 11 Page 49, Line 17		
Page 49, Line 21 Page 49, Line 24		
Page 50, Line 2 Page 50, Line 2		
Page 50, Line 20 Page 51, Line 10		
Page 51, Line 13 Page 51, Line 13		
Page 51, Line 17 Page 51, Line 23		
Page 52, Line 1 Page 52, Line 1		
Page 57, Line 7 Page 57, Line 24		
Page 60, Line 25 Page 61, Line 1		
Page 61, Line 5 Page 61, Line 7		
Page 61, Line 17 Page 62, Line 4		
Page 62, Line 12 Page 62, Line 15		
Page 62, Line 19 Page 62, Line 25		
Page 63, Line 4 Page 63, Line 10		
Page 63, Line 14 Page 63, Line 14		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 63, Line 16 Page 63, Line 19		
Page 63, Line 25 Page 64, Line 5		
Page 65, Line 12 ("Was...") Page 65, Line 24		
Page 66, Line 18 Page 67, Line 9		
Page 67, Line 13 Page 68, Line 4		
Page 68, Line 8 Page 68, Line 15		
Page 69, Line 24 Page 70, Line 4		
Page 70, Line 8 Page 70, Line 16		70:17-22
Page 71, Line 10 Page 71, Line 15		
Page 71, Line 20 Page 71, Line 24		
Page 72, Line 2 Page 72, Line 7	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 72, Line 12 Page 72, Line 13	<i>Id.</i>	
Page 72, Line 20 Page 72, Line 25		
Page 73, Line 3 Page 73, Line 6		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 73, Line 8 Page 73, Line 19		
Page 74, Line 2 Page 74, Line 3		
Page 74, Line 6 Page 74, Line 16	Plaintiffs object to 74:8-16 on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	75:13 – 76:12 76:21 – 77:16
Page 80, Line 16 Page 80, Line 24		
Page 81, Line 2 Page 81, Line 2		
Page 81, Line 23 Page 81, Line 25		82:1-8
Page 82, Line 20 Page 82, Line 22		
Page 82, Line 24 Page 83, Line 7		
Page 83, Line 10 Page 83, Line 10		83:11-16
Page 83, Line 17 Page 83, Line 24	Plaintiffs object to 83:22-24 on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 84, Line 2 Page 84, Line 3	Plaintiffs object to this excerpt on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 105, Line 19 Page 105, Line 23		
Page 106, Line 15 Page 106, Line 23		

Toyota's Designations from Deposition of Andrew Adams	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 107, Line 1 Page 107, Line 1		
Page 107, Line 18 Page 108, Line 9		
Page 109, Line 24 Page 110, Line 13		110:14 - 111:2
Page 112, Line 20 Page 113, Line 1	Objection to hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 113, Line 20 Page 113, Line 22	Objection to hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 118, Line 6 Page 118, Line 10		
Page 118, Line 13 Page 118, Line 23		
Page 119, Line 16 Page 119, Line 23		
Page 119, Line 25 Page 120, Line 5		
Page 120, Line 8 Page 120, Line 8		

Deposition of Mark Amstock

Defendants' Designations from Deposition Mark Amstock	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness

Defendants' Designations from Deposition Mark Amstock	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 7, Line 21 Page 7, Line 23		
Page 8, Line 2 Page 8, Line 8		
Page 11, Line 20 Page 13, Line 7		
Page 48, Line 4 Page 48, Line 18		49:8 – 50:21
Page 73, Line 10 Page 73, Line 15		
Page 74, Line 8 Page 74, Line 24	Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion, especially considering that Toyota produced multiple advertisements showing that Toyota markets its products specifically to minority families such as the Greene family.	80:12-24 105:20 - 106:6 117:8-21
Page 77, Line 6 Page 78, Line 1	Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay from a biased and subjective witness. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion especially considering that Toyota produced multiple advertisements showing that Toyota markets its products in ethnic magazines.	80:12-24 105:20 - 106:6 117:8-21
Page 121, Line 17 Page 122, Line 22		

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition Mark Amstock	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		<u>Cross designations</u> 7:12-14 7:18-20 9:4-7 11:5-12 13:4-11 16:4-11 18:7-23 21:2-13 22:8-19 23:23 – 24:2 25:7-20 26:5-7 28:7-22 44:7 – 45:4 45:15 – 46:25 48:4-11 49:8 – 50:21 51:4-10 51:25 – 52:5 52:12 – 53:14 53:25 – 55:3 57:7-15 58:3-7 59:12-19 61:16-25 62:21-24 64:1-6 64:22 – 65:12

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition Mark Amstock	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		<u>Cross designations (cont.)</u> 64:22 – 65:12 67:15-20 68:17-22 70:1-16 81:8-24 88:15-25 94:12 – 95:4 95:7-12 95:13 – 96:13 97:18-23 99:24 – 100:12 102:5-15 104:4-19 107:16 – 108:6 117:8-21 117:22 – 118:9 119:9 – 120:16 123:13-23

Deposition of Dexter Barkley

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to all testimony from this witness regarding accident reconstruction, causation and negligence determinations. <i>See, e.g., Lopez-Juarez v. Kelly</i> , 348 S.W.3d 10, 21 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2011, pet. denied)(trial court abused its discretion in admitting opinion testimony of police officer regarding causation and negligence because the police officer did not have extensive training in accident reconstruction and disclaimed expertise); <i>Walker v. Rangel</i> , No. 14-08-00643-CV, 2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 9215 (Tex. App. Houston [14th Dist.] Dec. 9, 2009, no pet.) (trial court abused its discretion in admitting the testimony of a police officer who had twenty years of experience and had investigated approximately 150 accidents, but who had received only basic training in accident investigation and admitted he was not an accident reconstruction expert); <i>Pilgrim's Pride Corp. v. Smoak</i> , 134 S.W.3d 880, 891-892 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2004, pet. denied)(police officer not trained in accident reconstruction was not qualified to opine on whose negligence caused the accident); <i>Lopez v. So. Pac. Transp. Co.</i> , 847 S.W.2d 330, 334-35 (Tex.App.-El Paso 1993, no writ)(police officer not qualified to testify regarding cause of accident where there was no showing of specialized knowledge in accident reconstruction).	
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 7, Line 5 Page 7, Line 8		
Page 8, Line 11 Page 9, Line 2		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 9, Line 7 Page 10, Line 25	Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704. Additionally, the testimony relies in great part on speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	10:11-18
Page 12, Line 23 Page 15, Line 20		
Page 16, Line 12 Page 20, Line 4	Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704. Plaintiffs object to 17:24 – 18:6 on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 21, Line 21 Page 24, Line 22		
Page 29, Line 1 Page 42, Line 15	Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704. Plaintiffs object to 36:1-5 on the grounds that this is speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	
Page 42, Line 25 Page 43, Line 15	Plaintiffs object to 43:1-15 on the grounds that testimony regarding pictures taken by someone else is speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 43, Line 20 Page 49, Line 19	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object to 43:20 – 44:18 on the grounds that testimony regarding pictures taken by someone else is speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object to 45:6-17 on the grounds of lack of foundation, speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object to 49:4-23 on the grounds of lack of speculation from non-contemporaneous note-taking and that this speculative testimony is hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	
Page 50, Line 11 Page 50, Line 24	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object to 45:6-17 on the grounds of lack of foundation, speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	74:22 – 75:7
Page 51, Line 5 Page 51, Line 8	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds of lack of foundation, speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of this excerpt is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	74:22 – 75:7

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 51, Line 24 Page 52, Line 16	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds of lack of foundation, speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	55:4-8 74:22 – 75:7
Page 52, Line 25 Page 53, Line 3	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds of lack of foundation, speculation and hearsay. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	53:12-16 55:4-8 74:22 – 75:7
Page 56, Line 13 Page 61, Line 24	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	
Page 62, Line 7 Page 69, Line 7	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 69, Line 12 Page 70, Line 1	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	
Page 73, Line 21 Page 74, Line 4	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds of relevance and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	74:5-5
Page 88, Line 11 Page 88, Line 18	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	
Page 105, Line 10 Page 109, Line 19	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	
Page 118, Line 19 Page 122, Line 15	<p>Plaintiffs object on the grounds that this is Defendants' attempt to admit alleged and untimely expert testimony from someone not qualified as an expert. Thus, it is inadmissible under FRE 702, 703 and 704.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also object on the grounds of lack of foundation and speculation. Furthermore, the probative value, if any, of these excerpts is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice and confusion.</p>	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dexter Barkley	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> 7:5-8 15:14-20 18:22 – 19:18 21:21 – 23:1 24:16 – 25:5 28:8 – 30:24 35:11-25 36:6 – 38:1 39:4-22 40:12 – 42:23 57:5-22 58:24 – 59:24 62:18 – 63:23 65:19-22 67:8-14 73:4-12 75:20 – 76:24 80:4 – 81:16 86:12 – 88:10 88:21 – 90:23 92:2-13 97:23 – 98:23 100:21 – 101:7 103:21 – 104:7 112:3-17 137:10-22 140:1-14 144:16 – 145:4

Deposition of Clinton Baughman

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Clinton Baughman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to all testimony from this witness regarding accident reconstruction, causation and negligence determinations. <i>See, e.g., Lopez-Juarez v. Kelly</i> , 348 S.W.3d 10, 21 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2011, pet. denied)(trial court abused its discretion in admitting opinion testimony of police officer regarding causation and negligence because the police officer did not have extensive training in accident reconstruction and disclaimed expertise); <i>Walker v. Rangel</i> , No. 14-08-00643-CV, 2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 9215 (Tex. App. Houston [14th Dist.] Dec. 9, 2009, no pet.) (trial court abused its discretion in admitting the testimony of a police officer who had twenty years of experience and had investigated approximately 150 accidents, but who had received only basic training in accident investigation and admitted he was not an accident reconstruction expert); <i>Pilgrim's Pride Corp. v. Smoak</i> , 134 S.W.3d 880, 891-892 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2004, pet. denied)(police officer not trained in accident reconstruction was not qualified to opine on whose negligence caused the accident); <i>Lopez v. So. Pac. Transp. Co.</i> , 847 S.W.2d 330, 334-35 (Tex.App.-El Paso 1993, no writ)(police officer not qualified to testify regarding cause of accident where there was no showing of specialized knowledge in accident reconstruction).	
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 8, Line 5 Page 8, Line 6		
Page 8, Line 13 Page 10, Line 7		
Page 10, Line 16 Page 11, Line 4		
Page 11, Line 18 Page 15, Line 24	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Clinton Baughman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 18, Line 13 Page 18, Line 17		
Page 18, Line 23 Page 19, Line 7	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 20, Line 8 Page 21, Line 4	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 21, Line 9 Page 21, Line 20	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 22, Line 9 Page 22, Line 11	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 22, Line 19 Page 24, Line 13	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 24, Line 20 Page 24, Line 24		
Page 25, Line 21 Page 26, Line 25	Irrelevant and unduly prejudicial, improper expert testimony	
Page 27, Line 8 Page 27, Line 22	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 28, Line 10 Page 29, Line 4	Irrelevant unduly prejudicial, improper expert testimony	
Page 29, Line 16 Page 30, Line 6		
Page 33, Line 16 Page 34, Line 1	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 34, Line 4 Page 34, Line 8	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	130:3-19
Page 34, Line 11 Page 34, Line 22	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	130:3-19
Page 37, Line 25 Page 38, Line 4	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Clinton Baughman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 38, Line 6 Page 38, Line 12	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 38, Line 15 Page 38, Line 15	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony. Misstates testimony	
Page 45, Line 13 Page 45, Line 25		
Page 52, Line 13 Page 52, Line 22		
Page 53, Line 11 Page 54, Line 23		
Page 58, Line 4 Page 58, Line 19		
Page 64, Line 13 Page 65, Line 10		
Page 67, Line 23 Page 68, Line 11		
Page 70, Line 22 Page 71, Line 15		
Page 72, Line 8 Page 72, Line 10		
Page 75, Line 19 Page 75, Line 25		
Page 76, Line 5 Page 76, Line 7		
Page 79, Line 18 Page 81, Line 6		
Page 86, Line 13 Page 86, Line 25		
Page 101, Line 2 Page 101, Line 11	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Clinton Baughman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 101, Line 14 Page 101, Line 22	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 101, Line 24 Page 101, Line 24	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 102, Line 23 Page 102, Line 24		
Page 103, Line 1 Page 103, Line 5	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 103, Line 7 Page 103, Line 9	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation, improper expert testimony	
Page 114, Line 21 Page 114, Line 25		
Page 115, Line 2 Page 115, Line 4	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation	
Page 115, Line 6 Page 115, Line 8	Irrelevant, speculation and unduly prejudicial, lacks foundation	
Page 131, Line 3 Page 131, Line 20		
Page 131, Line 23 Page 131, Line 23		
Page 137, Line 18 Page 138, Line 20		
Page 138, Line 22 Page 138, Line 24		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Clinton Baughman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> 8:5-7 8:19-22 11:18-23 18:13-22 24:20 – 25:20 25:21 – 26:17 28:10-18 29:11 – 30:6 32:11-15 42:20 – 43:14 46:20 – 47:16 49:7 – 51:10 52:13 – 56:4 57:14 – 58:3 58:12 – 59:21 60:7 – 61:5 62:7 – 63:19 64:13 – 65:10 66:7 – 67:13 67:23 – 68:11 75:19 – 76:4 78:3-24 111:4-16 111:19-22 125:9 – 126:10 126:17-22 139:1 – 140:2 137:18 – 138:24

Deposition of Charles Edwin Bird

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Edwin Bird	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to any use of this deposition on the grounds that the testimony is not relevant to any issue to be decided. However, even if the testimony were relevant it should be excluded under FRE 403 on the grounds that the probative value of the testimony, if any, is substantially outweighed by the danger of jury confusion and unfair prejudice	
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 7, Line 13 Page 7, Line 21	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 11, Line 9 Page 11, Line 18	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 12, Line 6 Page 12, Line 11	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 39, Line 4 Page 39, Line 6	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 39, Line 9 Page 39, Line 19	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 40, Line 4 Page 40, Line 6	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 40, Lin 9 Page 40, Line 11	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 41, Line 3 Page 41, Line 6	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 46, Line 17 Page 46, Line 22	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 47, Line 2 Page 47, Line 12	FRE 801, 401, and 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Edwin Bird	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 47, Line 16 Page 47, Line 23	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 48, Line 1 Page 48, Line 2	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 48, Line 6 Page 48, Line 12	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 60, Line 21 Page 60, Line 25	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 62, Line 8 Page 62, Line 10	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 62, Line 12 Page 62, Line 15	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 63, Line 8 Page 64, Line 17	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 78, Line 2 Page 78, Line 6	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 78, Line 22 Page 79, Line 3	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 79, Line 7 Page 79, Line 8	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 82, Line 20 Page 83, Line 16	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 83, Line 18 Page 83, Line 20	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 91, Line 20 Page 91, Line 22	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 92, Line 1 Page 92, Line 3	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 94, Line 7 Page 94, Line 8	FRE 801, 401, and 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Edwin Bird	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 94, Line 14 Page 94, Line 21	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 95, Line 1 Page 95, Line 7	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 95, Line 9 Page 95, Line 9	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 97, Line 21 Page 99, Line 7	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 99, Line 9 Page 99, Line 22	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 101, Line 2 Page 101, Line 22	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 101, Line 25 Page 101, Line 25	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 127, Line 17 Page 127, Line 23	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 128, Line 2 Page 128, Line 3	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 128, Line 7 Page 128, Line 9	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 128, Line 13 Page 128, Line 19	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 129, Line 2 Page 129, Line 6	FRE 801, 401, and 403	
Page 129, Line 9 Page 129, Line 9	FRE 801, 401, and 403	

Deposition of Joseph Burton

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Joseph Burton	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 9, Line 17 Page 9, Line 19	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 9, Line 24 Page 10, Line 15	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 11, Line 17 Page 14, Line 10	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 15, Line 2 Page 15, Line 11	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 16, Line 22 Page 18, Line 11	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 21, Line 21 Page 28, Line 6	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 30, Line 4 Page 45, Line 18	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 51, Line 24 Page 53, Line 8	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 53, Line 20 Page 63, Line 3	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 63, Line 16 Page 64, Line 25	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 69, Line 14 Page 71, Line 5	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 75, Line 8 Page 82, Line 3	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 88, Line 7 Page 90, Line 19	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 101, Line 12 Page 102, Line 9	FRE 801, 802, and 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Joseph Burton		Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 109, Line 12 Page 111, Line 22	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 118, Line 4 Page 118, Line 14	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 122, Line 21 Page 125, Line 12	FRE 801, 802, and 403	
Page 151, Line 25 Page 158, Line 15	FRE 801, 802, and 403	

Deposition of Harold Clyde

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Harold Clyde	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 8, Line 18 Page 8, Line 23		
Page 174, Line 22 Page 175, Line 3	FRE 702, 801, 802, and 403	175:10-15 176:9-10
		<u>Cross-designations</u> 8:12-17 9:7-11 11:12-18 11:22-24 12:6-11 13:21 – 14:9 16:1-10 18:19 – 19:9 19:13-18 19:25 – 20:6 23:17-23 23:24 – 26:10 28:18 – 30:5 31:4-19 32:16 – 33:2

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Harold Clyde	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- designations (cont.) 36:19 – 38:3 39:2-8 45:18-22 50:7-24 56:2-21 57:22 – 58:3 58:11 – 59:12 61:16 – 62:4 62:15 – 63:1 64:10 – 65:2 66:15 – 68:22 70:14 – 71:5 72:17-25 76:3 – 77:22 77:23 – 78:9 79:10 – 80:17 81:7-18 88:4-9 89:2-16 90:11 – 91:20 91:21 – 93:14 98:22 – 99:1 99:16 – 101:25

Deposition of Christopher Countryman

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Christopher Countryman	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	<p>Plaintiffs object to all testimony from this witness regarding accident reconstruction, causation and negligence determinations. <i>See, e.g., Lopez-Juarez v. Kelly</i>, 348 S.W.3d 10, 21 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2011, pet. denied)(trial court abused its discretion in admitting opinion testimony of police officer regarding causation and negligence because the police officer did not have extensive training in accident reconstruction and disclaimed expertise); <i>Walker v. Rangel</i>, No. 14-08-00643-CV, 2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 9215 (Tex. App. Houston [14th Dist.] Dec. 9, 2009, no pet.) (trial court abused its discretion in admitting the testimony of a police officer who had twenty years of experience and had investigated approximately 150 accidents, but who had received only basic training in accident investigation and admitted he was not an accident reconstruction expert); <i>Pilgrim's Pride Corp. v. Smoak</i>, 134 S.W.3d 880, 891-892 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2004, pet. denied)(police officer not trained in accident reconstruction was not qualified to opine on whose negligence caused the accident); <i>Lopez v. So. Pac. Transp. Co.</i>, 847 S.W.2d 330, 334-35 (Tex.App.-El Paso 1993, no writ)(police officer not qualified to testify regarding cause of accident where there was no showing of specialized knowledge in accident reconstruction).</p>	
	<p>Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative</p>	
<p>Page 6, Line 5 Page 6, Line 6</p>	<p>Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative</p>	
<p>Page 7, Line 8 Page 7, Line 21</p>	<p>Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative</p>	

Page 7, Line 25 Page 10, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 11, Line 16 Page 12, Line 5		
Page 13, Line 8 Page 13, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 14, Line 1 Page 15, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 16, Line 3 Page 16, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 11 Page 18, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 19, Line 3 Page 19, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 21, Line 22 Page 23, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 25, Line 5 Page 26, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 28, Line 2 Page 30, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 34, Line 8 Page 36, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 38, Line 11 Page 38 Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 6 Page 45, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 45, Line 6 Page 45, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 45, Line 16 Page 45, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 63, Line 7 Page 63, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 64, Line 1 Page 64, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 64, Line 3 Page 64, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
		<u>Cross-designations</u> 6:5-6 7:8-12 14:7-23 34:12 – 35:11 35:24 – 36:19 37:19 – 38:10 39:3-6 43:10 – 45:9 46:19 – 47:12 67:9-12 67:20-23 45:23 – 46:3

Deposition of Albert Cummins

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Albert Cummins	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to all testimony from this witness regarding accident reconstruction, causation and negligence determinations. <i>See, e.g., Lopez-Juarez v. Kelly</i> , 348 S.W.3d 10, 21 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2011, pet. denied)(trial court abused its discretion in admitting opinion testimony of police officer regarding causation and negligence because the police officer did not have extensive training in accident reconstruction and disclaimed expertise); <i>Walker v. Rangel</i> , No. 14-08-00643-CV, 2009 Tex. App. LEXIS 9215 (Tex. App. Houston [14th Dist.] Dec. 9, 2009, no pet.) (trial court abused its discretion in admitting the testimony of a police officer who had twenty years of experience and had investigated approximately 150 accidents, but who had received only basic training in accident investigation and admitted he was not an accident reconstruction expert); <i>Pilgrim's Pride Corp. v. Smoak</i> , 134 S.W.3d 880, 891-892 (Tex. App. Texarkana 2004, pet. denied)(police officer not trained in accident reconstruction was not qualified to opine on whose negligence caused the accident); <i>Lopez v. So. Pac. Transp. Co.</i> , 847 S.W.2d 330, 334-35 (Tex.App.-El Paso 1993, no writ)(police officer not qualified to testify regarding cause of accident where there was no showing of specialized knowledge in accident reconstruction).	
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 7, Line 5 Page 7, Line 18		
Page 8, Line 11 Page 10, Line 9		
Page 10, Line 22 Page 11, Line 18		
Page 12, Line 10 Page 12, Line 14		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Albert Cummins	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 13, Line 1 Page 13, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 13, Line 6 Page 13, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 13, Line 12 Page 13, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 14, Line 16 Page 14, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 15, Line 15 Page 15, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 16, Line 17 Page 16, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 12 Page 21, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 23, Line 16 Page 24, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 24, Line 19 Page 25, Line 3	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 25, Line 9 Page 25, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 26, Line 17 Page 27, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 29, Line 25 Page 30, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 30, Line 20 Page 31, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 33, Line 9 Page 33, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 34, Line 15 Page 35, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 35, Line 3 Page 35, Line 3	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 51, Line 9 Page 51, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 51, Line 25 Page 52, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 52, Line 11 Page 52, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 52, Line 22 Page 53, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 53, Line 10 Page 54, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 51, Line 11 Page 54, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 54, Line 18 Page 54, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 56, Line 21 Page 57, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 57, Line 6 Page 57, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 64, Line 8 Page 64, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 92, Line 13 Page 92, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 19 Page 98, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 101, Line 14 Page 102, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 102, Line 9 Page 102, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 102, Line 18 Page 103, Line 3		

		<div>Cross- <u>designations</u> 7:5-7 7:13-18 8:17-20 9:16-25 11:11-18 18:12-25 23:16 – 24:8 24:19 – 25:3 26:17 – 27:2 54:3-24 20:21 – 21:25 63:23 – 64:22</div>
--	--	--

Deposition of Dr. Tracy Dyer

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dr. Tracy Dyer	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition since the witness has not provided a foundation of expertise and a reliable methodology	
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801 and under 403	
Page 72, Line 11 Page 72, Line 20		50:4-22 54:5-7

Deposition of Ryan Earheart

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Ryan Earheart	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 24 Page 6, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 6, Line 13 Page 6, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 7, Line 18 Page 8, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 10, Line 20 Page 10, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 11, Line 4 Page 11, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 11, Line 13 Page 12, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 16, Line 8 Page 16, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 17, Line 1 Page 17, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 3 Page 19, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 25, Line 23 Page 26, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 31, Line 8 Page 32, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 33, Line 5 Page 33, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 33, Line 23 Page 34, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 36, Line 23 Page 37, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 40, Line 8 Page 40, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 46, Line 2 Page 46, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 46, Line 19 Page 47, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 56, Line 17 Page 57, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

		<u>Cross- designations</u> 5:24-25 6:1-2 9:19-24 8:9-23 11:4-9 11:23 – 12:15 14:1-8 15:12 – 16:4 16:11-16 17:1 – 18:9 18:24 – 20:24 21:15 – 22:2 22:20 – 24:11 25:1-8 26:13-19 29:7-13 31:8 – 33:11 33:23 – 39:14 41:15 – 43:12 51:2-15
--	--	---

Deposition of Kyle Evans

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Kyle Evans	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 6, Line 5 Page 6, Line 6		
Page 8, Line 3 Page 8, Line 24		
Page 10, Line 12 Page 13, Line 24		
Page 14, Line 12 Page 15, Line 12		
Page 16, Line 11 Page 21, Line 14		
Page 22, Line 13 Page 27, Line 7		
Page 33, Line 16 Page 36, Line 24		
Page 44, Line 8 Page 44, Line 21		
Page 56, Line 21 Page 57, Line 13		
Page 90, Line 17 Page 92, Line 6		
Page 93, Line 17 Page 95, Line 11		
Page 96, Line 12 Page 98, Line 1		

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Kyle Evans	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
---	-------------------------------	--

		<p><u>Cross-designations</u></p> <p>6:5-6</p> <p>8:6 – 9:3</p> <p>10:12-15</p> <p>12:1-8</p> <p>16:11 – 18:19</p> <p>19:18-23</p> <p>24:25 – 26:15</p> <p>27:11 – 28:25</p> <p>35:25 – 36:17</p> <p>37:19 – 38:2</p> <p>38:18 – 39:4</p> <p>41:12 – 43:9</p> <p>45:15 – 46:25</p> <p>47:17-20</p> <p>50:21 – 51:11</p> <p>51:23 – 52:8</p> <p>53:6 – 54:19</p> <p>54:25 – 55:17</p> <p>55:23 – 56:10</p> <p>56:21 – 58:4</p> <p>58:8 – 59:12</p> <p>59:23 – 64:2</p> <p>64:12 – 66:3</p> <p>71:5 – 72:8</p> <p>76:17-25</p> <p>77:17-21</p> <p>79:4-21</p> <p>83:2 – 84:15</p> <p>95:14-22</p> <p>102:18 – 103:15</p> <p>106:10-12</p>
--	--	--

Deposition of Ichiro Fukumoto Volume I – June 7, 2013

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Ichiro Fukumoto Volume I – June 7, 2013	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801 and more prejudicial than probative	
Page 8, Line 5 Page 8, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 9, Line 4 Page 9, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 9, Line 21 Page 10, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 13, Line 13 Page 14, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 21 Page 19, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 2 Page 44, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 47, Line 4 Page 47, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 102, Line 7 Page 104, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 105, Line 4 Page 105, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 109, Line 25 Page 112, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 116, Line 1 Page 117, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 124, Line 1 Page 124, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 125, Line 1 Page 128, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

		<p>Cross <u>designations</u></p> <p>8:5-9</p> <p>9:11-14</p> <p>14:11-25</p> <p>18:21 – 19:18</p> <p>20:1 – 21:9</p> <p>22:12-24</p> <p>23:4-25</p> <p>24:6 – 25:14</p> <p>25:18 – 26:16</p> <p>29:9-23</p> <p>34:25 – 35:4</p> <p>35:11-19</p> <p>36:16-22</p> <p>59:1 – 60:1</p> <p>60:3-11</p> <p>60:23 – 61:17</p> <p>69:2 – 70:17</p> <p>72:7-13</p> <p>73:16 – 74:8</p> <p>89:18 – 90:9</p> <p>94:18-24</p> <p>104:9-14</p> <p>106:20 – 107:9</p> <p>107:17 – 108:4</p> <p>113:13 – 115:25</p> <p>117:25 – 118:25</p> <p>127:3 – 128:19</p>
--	--	---

Deposition of Ichiro Fukumoto Volume II – June 8, 2013

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Ichiro Fukumoto Volume II – June 8, 2013	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 20, Line 11 Page 20, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 30, Line 2 Page 30, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 31, Line 25 Page 32, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 37, Line 3 Page 37, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 10 Page 44, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 45, Line 3 Page 46, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 47, Line 9 Page 50, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 58, Line 16 Page 59, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 64, Line 23 Page 65, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 66, Line 22 Page 67, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 68, Line 4 Page 70, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
		<u>Cross-designation</u> 8:7-24 10:3 – 12:10 26:7-25 27:1-9 28:3-10 29:18 – 30:1 30:14-17 31:25 – 32:12 36:24 – 37:6 38:2 – 39:14 41:12 – 42:15 45:3-8 46:21 - 47:8 52:6-20 53:3-18 56:4 – 57:15 61:3-8 72:6-20 73:20 – 74:1 75:3-11

Deposition of Joe Gibson

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Joe Gibson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 25 Page 7, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 8, Line 2 Page 9, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 9, Line 24 Page 10, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 11, Line 23 Page 12, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 14, Line 14 Page 14, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 15, Line 24 Page 16, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 17, Line 18 Page 17, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 19, Line 19 Page 19, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 20, Line 2 Page 20, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 20, Line 22 Page 21, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 21, Line 5 Page 21, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 21, Line 17 Page 22, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 22, Line 4 Page 22, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 22, Line 11 Page 22, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 22, Line 16 Page 22, Line 22		
		<u>Cross-designations</u> 5:25 – 6:2 6:7-10 6:23 – 7:1 11:3-10 14:4-23 15:19-23 17:15-23 18:21 – 23:23 31:2 – 32:7

Deposition of Dr. Chester Gwin

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dr. Chester Gwin	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 6, Line 25 Page 7, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 8, Line 7 Page 10, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 10, Line 19 Page 11, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 12, Line 4 Page 15, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 15, Line 13 Page 17, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 14 Page 19, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 19, Line 9 Page 23, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 23, Line 20 Page 25, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 30, Line 23 Page 31, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 35, Line 16 Page 36, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 48, Line 18 Page 49, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 51, Line 24 Page 52, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 52, Line 17 Page 52, Line 25		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Gary Hatfield	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 25 Page 7, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 12, Line 24 Page 13, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 13, Line 12 Page 14, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 14, Line 22 Page 15, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 15, Line 10 Page 15, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 15, Line 16 Page 16, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 16, Line 4 Page 16, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 5, Line 25 Page 7, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 17, Line 2 Page 17, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 17, Line 25 Page 22, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 22, Line 22 Page 24, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 24, Line 9 Page 24, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 24, Line 23 Page 25, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 26, Line 10 Page 26, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 26, Line 25 Page 27, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 28, Line 2 Page 28, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 29, Line 7 Page 30, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 31, Line 6 Page 31, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 31, Line 18 Page 31, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 37, Line 8 Page 37, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 40, Line 13 Page 40, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 41, Line 19 Page 41, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 9 Page 44, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 18 Page 44, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 44, Line 23 Page 45, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 50, Line 1 Page 50, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 52, Line 23 Page 53, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 31, Line 18 Page 31, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 53, Line 22 Page 54, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 55, Line 3 Page 55, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 57, Line 2 Page 57, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 57, Line 22 Page 58, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 59, Line 13 Page 59, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 61, Line 13 Page 61, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 63, Line 5 Page 63, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 64, Line 12 Page 64, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 65, Line 19 Page 66, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 73, Line 3 Page 74, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 74, Line 22 Page 75, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 75, Line 13 Page 75, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 76, Line 7 Page 77, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 78, Line 17 Page 78, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 78, Line 24 Page 79, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 80, Line 7 Page 80, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 13 Page 80, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 25 Page 81, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 81, Line 13 Page 81, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 57, Line 2 Page 57, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 83, Line 13 Page 84, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Gary Hatfield	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations -
		<u>Cross-designations</u> 5:25 – 6:2 6:16 – 7:6 17:2-16 20:12-17 23:3 – 24:13 25:1-13 26:19 – 27:2 27:13-19 28:2-16 35:6-16 37:8-20 30:9-14 34:2-4 34:12-14 78:4-8 14:22 – 15:7 38:25 – 40:7 41:19 – 43:16 44:9 – 45:10 47:9 – 48:8 74:22 – 75:12 71:3 – 72:3 73:3-20 78:17 – 79:1 79:6-10 80:7 – 81:13 83:13 – 84:3

Deposition of James Jay Jackson

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of James Jay Jackson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 7, Line 6 Page 7, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 7, Line 12 Page 7, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 8, Line 1 Page 8, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 8, Line 10 Page 8, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 9, Line 18 Page 10, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 10, Line 9 Page 11, Line 3	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 14, Line 10 Page 15, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 16, Line 21 Page 17, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 2 Page 18, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 18, Line 20 Page 18, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 18, Line 25 Page 19, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 26, Line 20 Page 27, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 29, Line 22 Page 30, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 33, Line 20 Page 33, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 36, Line 19 Page 36, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 42, Line 16 Page 44, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 45, Line 17 Page 45, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 47, Line 17 Page 49, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 52, Line 24 Page 53, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 57, Line 9 Page 57, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 57, Line 20 Page 57, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 58, Line 22 Page 59, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 59, Line 18 Page 59, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 60, Line 1 Page 60, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 62, Line 17 Page 62, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 73, Line 14 Page 73, Line 15	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 73, Line 17 Page 73, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 74, Line 2 Page 74, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 74, Line 7 Page 74, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 76, Line 9 Page 76, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 77, Line 1 Page 77, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 79, Line 6 Page 79, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 5 Page 80, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 9 Page 80, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 81, Line 22 Page 81, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 82, Line 2 Page 82, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 87, Line 7 Page 87, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 87, Line 14 Page 89, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 89, Line 10 Page 89, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 89, Line 16 Page 89, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 92, Line 23 Page 93, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 3 Page 97, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 97, Line 12 Page 97, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 18 Page 98, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 98, Line 7 Page 98, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 98, Line 21 Page 99, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 99, Line 10 Page 99, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 99, Line 15 Page 99, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 99, Line 23 Page 99, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of James Jay Jackson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> 7:6-9 7:12-23 8:18-21 10:9 – 11:3 12:1-7 12:20-22 13:6-9 18:8-14 20:1-11 21:3-15 22:1 – 25:12 25:13 – 27:13 28:7 – 30:7 31:6 – 32:8 34:1-12 34:15-25 35:1-23 36:19-24 38:16 – 39:9 42:16 – 43:21 43:24 – 50:9 50:20 – 51:7 51:21 – 52:16 53:14 – 56:17 58:1 – 59:10 59:20-24 60:1-4 61:10-15 62:1-9 63:7 – 64:8 73:24 – 74:9 75:14 – 76:7 76:9-20 79:6-23 80:5-9 80:21-23 81:22 – 83:17

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of James Jay Jackson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- designations (cont.) 85:5-25 87:7 – 89:2 89:10-25 91:2-7 92:23 – 93:12 97:3 – 99:10 99:11-23

Deposition of Frank Katz

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Frank Katz	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 9, Line 13 Page 9, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 9, Line 22 Page 10, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 11, Line 5 Page 11, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 12, Line 14 Page 13, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 13, Line 7 Page 13, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 19, Line 1 Page 19, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 22, Line 15 Page 22, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 23, Line 15 Page 23, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 25, Line 21 Page 26, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 39, Line 2 Page 39, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 39, Line 14 Page 39, Line 15	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 39, Line 17 Page 39, Line 18	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 40, Line 10 Page 40, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 42, Line 4 Page 42, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 42, Line 11 Page 42, Line 11	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 45, Line 5 Page 45, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 17 Page 80, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 80, Line 22 Page 80, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 84, Line 23 Page 85, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 85, Line 21 Page 86, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 96, Line 19 Page 96, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 96, Line 24 Page 97, Line 3	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 5 Page 97, Line 9	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 11 Page 97, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 16 Page 97, Line 23	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 97, Line 25 Page 98, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 98, Line 15 Page 98, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 98, Line 24 Page 99, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 99, Line 6 Page 99, Line 6	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Frank Katz	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 112, Line 18 Page 113, Line 5	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 114, Line 24 Page 115, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 115, Line 21 Page 115, Line 24	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 116, Line 1 Page 116, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 116, Line 19 Page 116, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 117, Line 3 Page 118, Line 8	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 118, Line 10 Page 118, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 120, Line 13 Page 120, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 123, Line 19 Page 123, Line 21	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 123, Line 24 Page 124, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 140, Line 11 Page 140, Line 14	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 146, Line 16 Page 146, Line 20	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 146, Line 22 Page 146, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 150, Line 1 Page 150, Line 3	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 150, Line 5 Page 150, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 153, Line 17 Page 153, Line 22	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 153, Line 24 Page 154, Line 4	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 154, Line 6 Page 154, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 172, Line 10 Page 172, Line 16	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 181, Line 24 Page 182, Line 1	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 182, Line 3 Page 182, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Page 182, Line 9 Page 182, Line 13	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 182, Line 15 Page 182, Line 19	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 182, Line 21 Page 182, Line 25	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 183, Line 2 Page 183, Line 15	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 183, Line 17 Page 183, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 185, Line 11 Page 185, Line 15	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 185, Line 17 Page 185, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 185, Line 22 Page 186, Line 2	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 189, Line 21 Page 190, Line 7	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Frank Katz	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 190, Line 9 Page 190, Line 12	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 201, Line 8 Page 201, Line 17	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	
Page 213, Line 3 Page 213, Line 10	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801. Plaintiffs also object that the testimony is irrelevant, lacks foundation and expertise, and is more prejudicial than probative	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Frank Katz	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		9:13-18 11:5-7 12:2-3 13:7-10 17:4-6 17:11 – 20:23 26:4-11 27:16 – 28:5 32:12 – 33:15 37:2-7 39:2-6 39:14-18 39:25 – 42:1 42:4-11 43:9-16 44:5-14 45:5-9 47:16 – 48:19 50:10-18 53:8-15 58:11-15 64:20-25 68:8-22 69:24-25 71:10-23 73:14-21 75:7 – 77:12 77:16-18 78:6 – 79:14 80:17-24

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Frank Katz	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		82:9-25 87:9-15 89:20 – 90:2 91:13-21 98:1-9 99:12-18 100:14 – 101:3 104:13-17 108:14 – 109:3 109:14 – 110:7 112:18-21 113:19-22 114:10-22

Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 10, Line 9 Page 11, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 12, Line 1 Page 12, Line 6	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 12, Line 18 Page 14, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 14, Line 4 Page 14, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 16, Line 10 Page 17, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 18, Line 16 Page 19, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 19, Line 12 Page 20, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 20, Line 7 Page 20, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 21, Line 12 Page 21, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 21, Line 19 Page 21, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 22, Line 3 Page 22, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 23, Line 3 Page 23, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 24, Line 3 Page 25, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 25, Line 24 Page 26, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 27, Line 1 Page 28, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 4 Page 28, Line 4	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 15 Page 28, Line 16	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 19 Page 28, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 25 Page 29, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 29, Line 17 Page 29, Line 23	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 31, Line 4 Page 31, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 36, Line 25 Page 38, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 38, Line 10 Page 39, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 39, Line 22 Page 44, Line 22	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 47, Line 14 Page 48, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 48, Line 10 Page 48, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 48, Line 22 Page 49, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 49, Line 6 Page 49, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 49, Line 18 Page 49, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 51, Line 11 Page 54, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 54, Line 14 Page 54, Line 24	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 55, Line 2 Page 57, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 6 Page 57, Line 20	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 23 Page 62, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 64, Line 11 Page 64, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 64, Line 24 Page 68, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 68, Line 7 Page 70, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 72, Line 23 Page 73, Line 12	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 73, Line 15 Page 73, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 73, Line 21 Page 74, Line 13	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 75, Line 11 Page 75, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 75, Line 21 Page 76, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 76, Line 18 Page 76, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 77, Page 1 Page 77, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 78, Line 17 Page 78, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 78, Line 24 Page 79, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 79, Line 8 Page 80, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 81, Line 7 Page 82, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 88, Line 22 Page 89, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 96, Line 15 Page 96, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 96, Line 20 Page 97, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 97, Line 5 Page 97, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 97, Line 22 Page 98, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 102, Line 18 Page 103, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 103, Line 12 Page 104, Line 25	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 106, Line 25 Page 107, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 107, Line 17 Page 107, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Charles Derrick Moody	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> 10:16-18 12:18 – 14:3 14:25 – 15:24 16:5-21 52:14 – 54:8 62:16 – 64:7 66:19 – 68:14 68:18 – 69:17 83:12 – 88:1 89:16 – 92:6 113:12-21

Deposition of Gregory Joseph Prinzo

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Gregory Joseph Prinzo	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 22 Page 5, Line 23		
Page 6, Line 2 Page 6, Line 25		
Page 11, Line 25 Page 12, Line 2		
Page 14, Line 20 Page 14, Line 23		
Page 15, Line 1 Page 15, Line 4		
Page 15, Line 23 Page 15, Line 25		
Page 19, Line 11 Page 19, Line 13		
Page 20, Line 1 Page 20, Line 8		
Page 20, Line 10 Page 20, Line 11		
Page 22, Line 21 Page 22, Line 23		
Page 23, Line 1 Page 23, Line 7		
Page 23, Line 15 Page 24, Line 1		
Page 24, Line 4 Page 24, Line 10		
Page 24, Line 13 Page 24, Line 15		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Gregory Joseph Prinzo	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 24, Line 25 Page 25, Line 5		
Page 25, Line 8 Page 25, Line 10		
Page 26, Line 15 Page 26, Line 25		
Page 27, Line 9 Page 27, Line 21		
Page 31, Line 22 ("You're...") Page 32, Line 2		
Page 40, Line 21 Page 40, Line 23		
Page 40, Line 25 Page 41, Line 6		
Page 43, Line 17 Page 43, Line 20		
Page 43, Line 23 Page 44, Line 2		
Page 44, Line 6 Page 44, Line 8		
Page 44, Line 12 Page 44, Line 17		
Page 51, Line 22 Page 52, Line 7		
Page 53, Line 6 Page 53, Line 8		
Page 53, Line 11 Page 53, Line 14		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Gregory Joseph Prinzo	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 55, Line 5 Page 55, Line 21		
Page 56, Line 20 ("is...") Page 56, Line 23		
Page 57, Line 18 ("Volvo...") Page 57, Line 23		

Deposition of Dr. Lynn Salzberger

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dr. Lynn Salzberger	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
	Plaintiffs also object to use of this deposition as hearsay under FRE 801	
Page 6, Line 25 Page 7, Line 13		
Page 7, Line 24 Page 8, Line 8		
Page 8, Line 16 Page 9, Line 5		
Page 9, Line 14 Page 10, Line 8		
Page 10, Line 13 Page 12, Line 3		
Page 12, Line 5 Page 12, Line 7		
Page 13, Line 8 Page 15, Line 12		
Page 16, Line 20 Page 18, Line 8		
Page 18, Line 12 Page 19, Line 1		
Page 20, Line 22 Page 21, Line 2		
Page 21, Line 9 Page 22, Line 4		
Page 22, Line 13 Page 23, Line 8		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Dr. Lynn Salzberger	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 23, Line 14 Page 24, Line 15		
Page 41, Line 9 Page 41, Line 20		
Page 43, Line 11 Page 43, Line 24		
Page 50, Line 18 Page 53, Line 19		

Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 22 Page 6, Line 20		
Page 8, Line 23 Page 9, Line 16		
Page 9, Line 19 Page 9, Line 25		
Page 10, Line 3 Page 10, Line 5		
Page 10, Line 12 Page 10, Line 16		
Page 11, Line 3 Page 13, Line 17		
Page 16, Line 11 Page 17, Line 15		
Page 18, Line 6 Page 18, Line 11		
Page 18, Line 19 Page 19, Line 20		
Page 21, Line 10 Page 21, Line 14		
Page 22, Line 3 Page 22, Line 16		
Page 24, Line 13 Page 24, Line 23		
Page 25, Line 5 Page 25, Line 21		
Page 26, Line 2 Page 29, Line 6		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 29, Line 13 Page 30, Line 16		
Page 30, Line 19 Page 32, Line 1		
Page 34, Line 3 Page 35, Line 4		
Page 36, Line 18 Page 36, Line 20		
Page 36, Line 22 Page 37, Line 7		
Page 38, Line 6 Page 38, Line 21		
Page 38, Line 23 Page 39, Line 11		
Page 39, Line 13 Page 39, Line 25		
Page 40, Line 4 Page 40, Line 14		
Page 40, Line 21 Page 41, Line 9		
Page 41, Line 11 Page 41, Line 25		
Page 42, Line 24 Page 43, Line 18		
Page 47, Line 1 Page 47, Line 8		
Page 48, Line 13 Page 49, Line 5		
Page 49, Line 7 Page 50, Line 4		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 51, Line 9 Page 51, Line 21		
Page 54, Line 7 Page 54, Line 10		
Page 55, Line 9 Page 55, Line 17		
Page 60, Line 10 Page 63, Line 16		
Page 63, Line 18 Page 64, Line 1		
Page 65, Line 7 Page 65, Line 11		
Page 65, Line 25 Page 66, Line 2		
Page 67, Line 18 Page 69, Line 14		
Page 70, Line 17 Page 70, Line 21		
Page 71, Line 4 Page 71, Line 12		
Page 73, Line 25 Page 74, Line 7		
Page 77, Line 15 Page 77, Line 19		
Page 81, Line 15 Page 81, Line 22		
Page 82, Line 10 Page 82, Line 20		
Page 85, Line 24 Page 86, Line 5		

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 86, Line 7 Page 86, Line 19		
Page 86, Line 21 Page 87, Line 16		
Page 87, Line 18 Page 89, Line 16		
Page 89, Line 18 Page 89, Line 18		
Page 90, Line 17 Page 92, Line 7		
Page 92, Line 10 Page 92, Line 14		
		<u>Cross-designations</u> 5:22 – 6:11 7:14-24 8:10-18 8:23 – 12:10 13:8 – 14:18 15:2 – 17:20 18:15 – 19:18 20:2-24 26:2 – 27:16 28:3-20 31:4-23 32:11-20

Defendants’ Designations from Deposition of Daniel Sprinkle	Plaintiffs’ Objections	Plaintiffs’ Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> (cont.) 34:4 – 37:7 37:22 – 39:8 40:18 – 41:6 42:9 – 43:14 44:3-13 44:23 – 45:8 46:20 – 47:25 48:13-17 48:22-23 49:3-24 51:9-11 54:7-15 55:18 – 56:6 84:24 – 92:7

Deposition of Jerry Talton

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Jerry Talton	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 5, Line 24 Page 6, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 6, Line 15 Page 7, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 8, Line 20 Page 9, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 9, Line 15 Page 10, Line 4	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 13, Line 6 Page 13, Line 7	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 13, Line 20 Page 16, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 16, Line 13 Page 16, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 17, Line 25 Page 18, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 23, Line 21 Page 24, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 25, Line 12 Page 25, Line 23	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 29, Line 23 Page 30, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 33, Line 16 Page 34, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 35, Line 6 Page 35, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 35, Line 20 Page 35, Line 23	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Jerry Talton	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 38, Line 1 Page 38, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 38, Line 11 Page 39, Line 4	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 44, Line 25 Page 45, Line 7	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 49, Line 8 Page 49, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 49, Line 13 Page 49, Line 22	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 49, Line 24 Page 50, Line 4	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 50, Line 6 Page 50, Line 6	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 7 Page 57, Line 10	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 12 Page 57, Line 16	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 18 Page 57, Line 22	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 57, Line 24 Page 58, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 58, Line 7 Page 58, Line 20	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 58, Line 22 Page 59, Line 12	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 59, Line 21 Page 59, Line 25	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 60, Line 2 Page 60, Line 16	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Jerry Talton	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 60, Line 18 Page 61, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 61, Line 5 Page 61, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 61, Line 18 Page 61, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 61, Line 23 Page 62, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 62, Line 4 Page 62, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 64, Line 6 Page 64, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 64, Line 11 Page 66, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 77, Line 2 Page 77, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 85, Line 6 Page 85, Line 20	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 85, Line 22 Page 86, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 87, Line 10 Page 87, Line 24	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
		Cross- designations 5:24 – 6:3 7:7-23 8:16-19 9:15-16 10:14-19 12:5-13

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Jerry Talton	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
		Cross- <u>designations</u> 13:6-7 13:20 – 17:8 17:22 – 18:8 18:9-19 23:2-8 23:14-17 23:21 – 26:7 26:22 – 27:3 27:18 – 28:4 30:16-21 31:4-10 36:18-24 37:17 – 38:5 39:9-18 48:14 – 51:3 52:23 – 53:4 55:3-24 57:7 – 59:4 60:3-10 62:13 – 63:3 64:18 – 65:7 65:15-22 66:1-25 69:2-6 69:21 – 70:6 79:16-20 77:2-8 81:14-25 82:11-21 84:14 – 85:14 86:14-25 88:18 – 89:7 91:19-22 92:1-4 93:11-14 94:24 – 95:7

Deposition of Brian J. Thompson

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Brian J. Thompson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 6, Line 5 Page 6, Line 6	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 8, Line 12 Page 9, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 11, Line 14 Page 15, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 15, Line 18 Page 19, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 19, Line 13 Page 20, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 20, Line 17 ("Which...") Page 23, Line 18	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 23, Line 25 Page 24, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 24, Line 23 Page 28, Line 14	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 18 Page 28, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 28, Line 24 Page 29, Line 13	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 29, Line 16 Page 39, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 39, Line 13 Page 40, Line 20	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 41, Line 8 Page 41, Line 16	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Brian J. Thompson	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 43, Line 15 Page 44, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 45, Line 13 Page 45, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
Page 59, Line 2 Page 59, Line 23	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403	
		Cross <u>designations</u> 6:5-6 6:16-17 8:12-15 12:1-21 13:21 – 14:14 17:10 – 18:8 18:17-19 21:9 – 22:4 30:3-25 31:23 – 32:21 33:18 – 34:1 34:16 – 35:1 35:9-22 36:20 – 37:19 38:5-11 39:9-15 46:22 – 48:9 48:15-24 49:7 – 53:2 66:13 – 67:7

Deposition of Michelle Vogler, PH.D., P.E.

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Michelle Vogler, PH.D., P.E	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 11, Line 22 Page 11, Line 23	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 12, Line 1 Page 12, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 12, Line 25 Page 13, Line 5	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 17, Line 8 Page 18, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 24, Line 22 Page 25, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 45, Line 10 Page 45, Line 24	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 68, Line 1 Page 70, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 71, Line 13 Page 71, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 71, Line 21 Page 73, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 74, Line 21 Page 75, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 82, Line 15 Page 82, Line 16	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 82, Line 18 Page 82, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 82, Line 21 Page 83, Line 3	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 84, Line 13 Page 84, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	

Defendants' Designations from Deposition of Michelle Vogler, PH.D., P.E	Plaintiffs' Objections	Plaintiffs' Rebuttal and Cross Designations - Incl. Optional Completeness
Page 85, Line 16 Page 85, Line 19	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 86, Line 15 Page 88, Line 15	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 89, Line 15 Page 91, Line 8	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 95, Line 6 Page 95, Line 10	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 95, Line 21 Page 96, Line 2	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 96, Line 9 Page 96, Line 21	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 97, Line 16 Page 98, Line 12	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 99, Line 7 Page 99, Line 22	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 109, Line 14 Page 109, Line 22	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 134, Line 12 Page 135, Line 12	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 183, Line 1 Page 184, Line 9	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 209, Line 7 Page 209, Line 11	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 210, Line 9 Page 210, Line 17	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 210, Line 22 Page 211, Line 1	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	
Page 226, Line 2 Page 226, Line 13	Hearsay, FRE 401, 403, 702	

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Aubrey "Nick" Pittman
AUBREY "NICK" PITTMAN
State Bar No. 16049750

THE PITTMAN LAW FIRM, P.C.
100 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75201-2112
214-459-3454
214-853-5912 – fax
pittman@thepittmanlawfirm.com

/s/ Daryl K. Washington
DARYL K. WASHINGTON
State Bar No. 24013714

LAW OFFICES OF DARYL K. WASHINGTON
325 N. St. Paul St., Suite 1975
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-880-4883
469-718-0380 - fax
dwashington@dwashlawfirm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 6, 2014, the foregoing pleading was filed with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case filing system of the court. The electronic case filing system sent a “Notice of Electronic Filing” to all attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of documents by electronic means.

/s/ Aubrey “Nick” Pittman
AUBREY “NICK” PITTMAN